

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,836	02/25/2005	Steffen Scholze	DE02 0196 US	9613
65913 NXP, B.V.	7590 10/09/200	7	EXAM	INER
NXP INTELL	ECTUAL PROPERTY	RADKIEWI	RADKIEWICZ, JARED	
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY	DRIVE	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, C	A 95131		2624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	10/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

•				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Off' - A - 4' O	10/525,836	SCHOLZE ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Jared W. Radkiewicz	2624		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o		•		
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2005 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Setion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/25/2005.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Amendments

This office action is responsive to the preliminary claim and specification amendment received on 2/25/2005. **Claims 1 - 8** remain pending

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bolle et al. (US 5,963,656).

Regarding **claim 1**, Bolle teaches a method of assessing the quality of skin print images, and particularly fingerprint images ("method for processing fingerprint images and rejecting poor quality and/or partial fingerprint images", Column 1 Line 6-9), characterized in that

gradients are formed for the individual picture elements (pixels) of the skin print images ("Specifically, step 840 first computes the directional histogram, for each block, based on the directions of pixels within it.", Column 7 Lines 46-48), in that

Art Unit: 2624

a mean value is formed from the gradients of the pixels in one region of the image (tile) at a time ("If there is a block direction, i.e., a prominent direction, the direction is noted", Column 7 Lines 34-36), and in that

similarities in the mean values from tile to tile form a measure of quality ("Q is therefore obtained by computing the ratio of total weights of directional blocks to the total weights for each of the blocks in the foreground", "The computed quality Q is used as a measure of how much reliable directional information is available for an acquired fingerprint image", Column 9 Line 24-31).

Regarding **claim 5**, Bolle also teaches a system for assessing fingerprint image quality ("system and method", Column 1 Line 7).

Regarding claims **3 and 7**, Bolle teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that

the mean values are entered in two directional matrices for x and y ("the directional histogram, for each block, based on the directions of pixels within it", Column 7 Line 47), in that

scalar products are formed of the directional matrices together with the matrices that are displaced horizontally, vertically and in the directions of both diagonals by one tile ("Note that in this embodiment, three neighbor pixels are selected in each of the positive (950) and negative (960) directions along each of the 0, 45, 90, and 135 degree directions/paths", Column 6 Line 47-51), in that

Art Unit: 2624

each of the products that were obtained in that way by multiplying the matrices are summed over all the tiles, and in that the sums are added together and are divided by the sum of the scalar products of the directional matrices with themselves in order to form the quality measure, said sum of the scalar products of the directional matrices with themselves being summed up over all tiles ("In a preferred embodiment, since all of the block have an equal area, the quality (i.e., the ratio of the areas above) of a fingerprint image Q is therefore obtained by computing the ratio of total weights of directional blocks to the total weights for each of the blocks in the foreground 1030, i.e. Q=.SIGMA.[w.sub.i; x.sub.i is a-directional block]/.SIGMA.[w.sub.i; x.sub.i is a foreground block] The computed quality Q is used as a measure of how much reliable directional information is available for an acquired fingerprint image. If the computed Q is less than the quality threshold, TH, the image is rejected 871", Column 9 Line 21-31).

Regarding claims 4 and 8, Bolle teaches a method as claimed in claims 1 and 5, respectively, characterized in that the lengths of the average gradients are used to determine a region of interest of the skin print that has been scanned ("One embodiment of the invention makes these determinations by summing the intensity differences between the pixels in the block and their neighbors along one or more directions to classify the pixels as either foreground or background pixels. Blocks with over a threshold number of background pixels are background blocks, the other blocks are foreground blocks", wherein "intensity differences between the pixels in the block and their neighbors along one or more directions" is a gradient operation and the

Art Unit: 2624

classification operation compares the gradient to a threshold value to decide if the pixel is foreground or background, Column 3 Lines 39-43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolle et al. (US 5,963,656) in view of Jain et al. (US 6,263,091 B1).

Regarding claims 2 and 6, Bolle teaches claims 1 and 5, respectively.

Bolle does not teach the method as claimed in claim 1 and 5, characterized in that the gradients formed initially, which have the components g.sub.x(alt) and g.sub.v(alt), are squared after the fashion of a complex number by

Jain teaches using gradient components in the complex domain ("Prewitt Operator", Jain Column 9 Lines 15-35), necessitating a transform similar to the Pythagorean triple represented by the formulas g.sub.x=g.sub.x(alt).sup.2-g.sub.y(alt).sup.2 and g.sub.y=2g.sub.x(alt)*g.sub.y(alt).

It would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the gradients of Bolle in a manner as suggested by Jain as a method of "obtaining mean 180-degree invariant X and Y gradients from the raw unprocessed

Art Unit: 2624

gradients" (Jain Column 9 Line 65) in a process to separate regions of interest in fingerprint images as seen in both Bolle and Jain.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jared W. Radkiewicz whose telephone number is (571) 270-1577. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian P. Werner can be reached on (571) 272-7401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JWR

BRIAN WERNER

CUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER